

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In the Matter of ALEXANDER V., A Person  
Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B176391

(Super. Ct. No. CK20870)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT  
OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

JOHNA C.,

Objector and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
D. Zeke Zeidler, Referee. Affirmed.

Sharon S. Rollo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Appellant.

Lloyd W. Pellman, County Counsel of Los Angeles County, for  
Respondent.

## INTRODUCTION

This is a so-called Sade C. case. Appellant Johna C. mother of Alexander V. appeals from the order of the juvenile court terminating her visitation with the child. We affirm.

## PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

We appointed counsel to represent mother in this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel notified this court in writing pursuant to *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, that she was unable to file an opening brief. By notice filed November 10, 2004, we advised mother to submit any contentions or issues she wished this court to consider within 30 days. The time in which to file mother's response was extended.

Mother filed a supplemental brief on January 1, 2005. We have reviewed the letter and the juvenile court record.

## DISCUSSION

It is a well-settled principle of appellate practice and of constitutional doctrine that judgments and orders of the trial court are presumed to be correct and the party challenging them must affirmatively show reversible error. (*Walling v. Kimball* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 364, 373; *Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.)

In response to our notice, mother submitted her supplemental letter brief in which she declares that the record does not accurately reflect the number of visits she has had with Alexander. Mother asserts that she "built a strong[,] loving bond" with Alexander. She states, "My endeavor towards making a bond with my son was to let him know I was there in his life because my son needed me from birth and knew I was his mommy, maybe not exactly but he knew I was the most special person in his life and he showed it. He showed he needed and loved me every time I saw him." The record reflects, however, that Alexander "has not responded well to the visits. The child . . . cries hysterically, and during the whole visit, he constantly asks for his mommy and daddy [his adoptive parents]. During

the visit, the child constantly clings to [the social worker] and cries.” The court terminated mother’s visits finding that it would be detrimental to Alexander to be forced to sit in a room crying for his adoptive parents. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.21, subd. (h).) The evidence supports this finding. (*In re Heather B.* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 535, 562-563.) We conclude that mother has failed to demonstrate trial court error and so we are compelled to affirm the order terminating her visits.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

ALDRICH, J.

We concur:

KLEIN, P. J.

KITCHING, J.